

My concerns regarding this proposal focus on personal copying of digital material. Does the insertion of digital copy protection in the signal and the interpretation of the protection by hardware devices mean the end of all copying?

If so, does that mean that digital VCRs are to be outlawed? Or must the digital VCRs be changed such that the copy function no longer applies? This must mean that a family that must to go church cannot record their favorite show to watch the next night. This seems to be a regression to pre-VCR days. It seems that this takes away rights, freedoms and privileges that private citizens have today.

If it does not mean the end of all copying, then that must mean that some material is "copyable" and some is not. How is a device to tell what is able to be copied and what is not? Presumably, by some signal contained with the broadcast material. If this is so, we are back to the VCR argument above. If it is not, then all the material is copyable, we are where we are today and why is legislation being considered.

I suppose you can try some form of limited copying but without all the devices involved in the copying and playback understanding the limitations, either the copy/playback fails (back to the VCR argument) or the copy/playback succeeds without the limitations in which case why bother with limitations.

At the end of the day, I don't see how we can hope to stop digital copying without rendering current technology already in our homes obsolete. Such forced technical obsolescence puts families in financial jeopardy to the extent that limited family resources must be deployed to purchase new hardware to try to keep the technical options they have today. While this is distasteful it is as nothing compared with the trampling of the court upheld copying rights we currently enjoy.

I am not anti big business or without sympathy concerning the rights of the copyright holders, I simply want to be able to record for my family.